'revious reference

R. 1/1 1862

191
S. R

File No. 5 of 1811

Serial Nos.

Later references.

Incomplete

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos.

Map ~~of Part~~ B for Dec 1871

SUBJECT.

Complaint against the
Fixed License fees on Arrack
Shops in Nagar Kurnool

Indexed

83

W D 1351—GPB—20,000—13-12-15

Rec 1871 118

From The Secretary to Government

To The Secretary to Chief Comm

Dated 14th August

Despatched 15th Augt.

Received 22nd Augt.

Enclosures No. nil

General No. 1465

Rev No. 110. } 1871.72

12.1.72

Vide orders in Secretary's Memo: 1

Dr. Lr.

In reply to his No 805 of the 10th Inst. reports on the complaint of the Amaeth Shoshthesa of the Wasiana Talook.

To Duftur for submission to Secretary with Duftur Memo No. 29 dt. 11th May 1870 and other references.

21.12.71.

11/12/72

Memo No 116 8/9/12

No 463
Rec'd 110.

Camp Ananthapoor
14th Dec 71
15th

To,

The Secretary to the Chief
Commissioner
of Mysore

Sir,

With reference to your letter No 805/10 dated the 16th inst 1870 forwarding for adoption a new form of Retail Arrack License, I have the honor to state that the Arrack Shop Keepers of the Wastara Taluk, complain that they experience the following inconveniences by being required to act up to the Conditions specified in the License.

1st That the shops cannot be removed to fairs and annual gatherings in the vicinity.

2nd That the purchasers cannot carry home liquor to their friends and relations and others sick who cannot go to the shop from their

2nd That the shopkeeper cannot
when prevented by sickness &c
or other business delegate the Vend
3 of liquor to any one else.
4 That the quantity of 2 drams
ordered to be sold is not strong
enough for the Inland people.

The deputy Superintendents
of the Districts have been consulted
whether any relaxation of the Rules
is considered necessary.

The first ground of complaint
is perfectly untenable. The right
to sell at such Fairs is generally vested
annually and in some instances forms
part of the rights of some adjacent Shop,
and the abolition of the restriction must
give rise to frequent quarrels between
Shopkeepers and facilitate smuggling.

As regards the 2nd I think it
is unsafe to make any exception
to the rule, though no doubt it
may occasion some hardship
to Certain people, and there
will also be no means of
checking

As regards the 3rd Complaint
it is only necessary to insert on the
License one or more names in addi-
tion to that of the Licensee Vendor,
so that they may sell liquor during
the absence of the latter.

With respect to the 4th Ground,
I beg to recommend that the former
rule allowing one Seer or 3 drams
to be sold to a person at a time may
be revised as it appears that 1 dram
is considered ~~as~~ insufficient quantity

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obed Servt

Albany
Superintendent
Inspr Dr

C Mills